Draft
BDAC MEETING SUMMARY
NOVEMBER 21, 1996
BURBANK AIRPORT HILTON AND CONVENTION CENTER
9:30 am to 4:00 pm

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (MIKE MADIGAN)

Chair Mike Madigan welcomed BDAC members and mentioned that the next BDAC meetings are scheduled for January 30, 1997, March 12 and April 10. Attachment 1 lists the BDAC members and Attachment 2 lists the members of public who attended the meeting.

Mr. Madigan announced that Deputy Secretary Garamendi of the U.S. Department of Interior was scheduled to appear at the meeting in the afternoon. Mr. Madigan then reviewed the "Suggested Guidelines for BDAC Deliberations" memo that's in the November 21, 1996 meeting packet and invited discussion on the guidelines.

Discussion Points

- BDAC member Alex Hildebrand basically agreed with the guidelines. Using the ecosystem restoration component, as an example, he explained that there may be agreement with general concepts regarding ecosystem benefits. But, when the component is combined with other parts of the Program and the solution principles are applied, people's opinions regarding the benefits may change.

- BDAC member Pietro Parravano inquired about an apparent inconsistency regarding substitutions for BDAC members and agency representatives. He noted that BDAC members do not have alternates, but at the November 21 meeting Wayne White substituted for U.S. Bureau of Reclamation representative Roger Patterson. Lester Snow (CALFED Bay-Delta Program Executive Director) responded that the BDAC charter requires that an appointed federal official be present at each meeting. In the event of Mr. Patterson's absence, a substitute must be appointed.

- BDAC member Mary Selkirk noted that as BDAC addresses linkages between the program components, there will be a need for someone to clearly summarize the sense of the group. She stated that this will become increasingly important as the stakes become higher. She also requested that CALFED staff clearly state how the BDAC Work Groups can best help the process. Chair Madigan agreed with her requests.

- BDAC member Ann Notthoff remarked that areas of disagreement, as well as agreement, should be noted in summarizing remarks. She was concerned that silence may be read as consent. BDAC member Roberta Borgonovo agreed with Ms. Selkirk and Ms. Noffhoff and noted that the sense of the group is not always explained in the meeting summaries.

- BDAC member Bob Raab mentioned that the Committee for Water Policy Consensus defined consensus as a specified majority of those who voted. Chair Madigan reminded the group that BDAC is advisory and having a numerical definition of consensus may encourage people to count votes rather than work hard on trying to reach unanimity on an issue.

- BDAC member Roger Strelow remarked that since BDAC is providing advice to the CALFED agency decision-makers, it will be more important to know who disagrees and how broad the disagreement extends across stakeholder groups. Mr. Patterson agreed with Mr. Strelow by stressing the importance that the meeting summaries record the sense of the group since BDAC's value is in its discussions. Chair Madigan then committed to providing BDAC with immediate feedback on the group's discussion on policy issues.

E-013972

- BDAC member Hap Dunning asked if BDAC will have opportunities to re-discuss issues on which consensus has not been reached. Chair Madigan responded by stating that if BDAC wants to revisit an issue, it may do so. Some issues will benefit from additional discussions, especially as components are refined and linked.

- Chair Madigan suggested a guideline for communicating with the public on BDAC deliberations. He asked that members accurately report on issues that BDAC has reached consensus on and clearly state when an opinion is their own or their organization's. He committed to maintaining the flow of the meetings while allowing full participation of BDAC members. He also asked that persons making public comment limit their public comments to three to five minutes to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to speak.

2. Phase II Process and Timeline (Lester Snow)

Presentation
Lester Snow explained that in Step 1 of Phase II, the focus of the Program is on individual components, but BDAC needs to look ahead to how the components may fit together. He reviewed the six steps and noted that discussion under agenda item 3 will jump ahead to Steps 2 and 3. He reminded the group that the Solution Principles will be met by the Program as a whole, rather than by individual components. He explained that the CALFED Program Final Environmental Impact Report/Statement is still scheduled for publication in the Fall of 1998. The schedule changes release of the Administrative Draft and public Draft EIR/EIS from summer to fall of 1997. This schedule will allow for more discussion of components and how they are integrated before publication of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Discussion
- BDAC member Tom Graff asked that the Phase II timeline be circulated and Lester Snow consented to do so (see attached).

3. Example of Component Integration and Linkage (Lester Snow)

Presentation
Lester Snow emphasized that the following presentation was intended to provide only an example of what a solution alternative could look like. He reviewed the CALFED mission, goals, objectives and the six solution principles, and noted that component integration allows a balancing of the solution principles and the broad public policy issues faced by the Program. He reviewed the six components and noted that operation of those components is an important aspect of any alternative. He also reiterated guiding assumptions used by the Program to help meet the objectives and reduce conflict in the system: 1) the value of water varies significantly by flow rate, time of year and water year type, and 2) ecosystem restoration will improve ecosystem function and recover species.

He then described the example alternative by geographic region; north of the Delta, in the Delta and south of the Delta. For the north of the Delta region, the example assumed an off-stream surface storage facility on the west side of the Sacramento Valley combined with a ground water conjunctive use program. A significant water quality component could be mine drainage control, specifically for Iron Mountain Mine. Stream habitat restoration could incorporate watershed restoration; location of restoration and implementation options would affect the types of benefits to the system.

Steve Yaeger, CALFED Bay-Delta Program Deputy Director, explained specific concerns with storage. He noted that surface storage and ground water management are dependent on each other. CALFED

E-013973

would likely use pilot programs to demonstrate approaches for addressing conjunctive management of the basins. Assurances would be needed to ensure surface storage facilities would be built and operated to limit the impacts of ground water use.

Dick Daniel (CALFED Bay-Delta Program staff) added that water in the storage facility could be used for ecosystem restoration as well as for export water supply. He also explained that controlling mine drainage would benefit water supplies because less water would be needed to dilute the toxins which currently harm salmon juveniles during the winter.

Lester Snow discussed the multiple benefits of increasing meander zones, fish screening, and restoring tributaries. Increasing meander zones provides ecosystem niches for fish and improves wildlife habitat. The SB 1086 program would compensate land owners for use of property that are prone to flooding. Screening diversions reduces entrainment of fish and provides more flexibility in timing of diversions. Restoring tributaries increases spawning and rearing habitat for endangered species and reduces Endangered Species Act conflicts. An expected result of appropriate screening and restoration is increased water supply benefits.

He then discussed linkage issues associated with storage. On a seasonal basis, increased surface storage may ensure spring flows for fisheries. Storage may increase water supply reliability and help with conjunctive water management because water could be carried over from one year to the next. Effective watershed management may provide a smoother hydrograph for improved operation of storage facilities which may allow for more effective use of ground water. Transfers may occur with fewer impacts and thus provide opportunities to provide water for fish and guard against adverse effects of drought.

Discussion Points

- BDAC member Stu Pyle asked if there were other urban and agricultural linkage issues. Lester Snow and Mr. Daniel said that the example did not differentiate between urban and agricultural issues. They also mentioned that flood protection and recreation, among many others, are other linkage issues which could be addressed by additional surface storage and effective ground water management. They also iterated that benefits extend not only to local water users, but to resources in the Delta and more reliable water supplies for other parts of the state.

- Ms. Selkirk asked if the many potential linkages will be prioritized. Lester Snow, Mr. Daniel and Stein Buer (CALFED Program staff) responded that the Program will develop several packages of operating rules which reflect stakeholder priorities. The proposed operating scenarios will then be modeled to demonstrate possible costs, benefits, engineering feasibility and environmental consequences. Current analysis has shown that most storage benefits come from storage amounts of up to 2 million acre feet.

- BDAC members Eric Hasseltine and Mary Selkirk asked for elaboration on the last point. Mr. Daniel and Mr. Buer responded by saying that the example assumes the stored water would be used for improving downstream water supplies. Existing Delta constraints dictate that conveyance capacity would remain generally as it is now, which lead to few additional benefits from more than 2 million acre feet of storage. Another example could assume the stored water would be allocated to environmental restoration and water supply. In that case the stored water would increase Delta outflows benefits for fisheries as well as for water supply reliability.

- Mr. Daniel then proceeded to explain that variable flows in the Sacramento river are important for the ecosystem. Therefore, DWR modeling would assume that a peak flood would flow through the system unimpeded. During subsequent peak flows, water could be taken from the backside of the hydrograph and stored at an area below Chico Landing. Lester Snow further explained that by storing water peak

E-013974

flows, water can be released during low flow periods to increase fisheries benefits. Later in the discussion, he mentioned that capturing water in one year avoids low-flow condition damages during spring of another year. If low flows during spring can be avoided, there is less likelihood of litigation and impact to species.

- BDAC member Roberta Borgonovo asked if copper releases from the North Sacramento Valley mines present a human health hazard and BDAC member Don Bransford asked if copper impacts exist in the Sacramento River and Delta. Mr. Daniel replied that direct effects appear to be limited to juvenile fish and invertebrates in the River, but food chain effects extend into the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

South Delta Examples
Presentation
Lester Snow made a distinction between on-aqueduct and existing storage facilities south of the Delta. On-aqueduct storage functions in the same way as off-stream storage would north of the Delta. Mr. Yaeger stated that on-aqueduct storage does not eliminate conflicts between fisheries and water supply diversions and that screening will play an important role in reducing impacts. Enhancing storage on the east side of the San Joaquin valley raises the additional concerns of oversubscribed watersheds, water allocation between environmental uses and water supply, and competition between local water agencies and ground water banking and conjunctive management. Rick Woodard (CALFED Program staff) highlighted problems with salt in the south of Delta water supply. Lester Snow completed the presentation by emphasizing that operation of facilities dictates the types of benefits and determines the number and level of third party impacts.

Discussion
- Mr. Pyle mentioned that it is difficult for individual agencies to address multiple benefits because their responsibilities are limited. He expressed support for the CALFED Program to overcome this limitation of existing institutions.

Bay - Delta Example
Presentation
Lester Snow described the Program's benefits to San Pablo Bay wetlands and how wetlands enhancement can be integrated into broader habitat restoration efforts. Restoration of fish, wildlife and plants needs to be compatible with Delta land-use patterns. He also mentioned the need to control industrial and urban water pollution at the source locations.

He further explained that the example integrates the through-Delta and isolated conveyance facilities found in Phase I Alternatives 2 and 3. He mentioned that having both types of facilities would provide flexibility in operating the system to achieve the benefits of increasing water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration. He also remarked that levee improvements would be designed to improve habitat. The improvements would be linked to improving channel capacity which may allow abandonment of some channels which in turn may create unique habitat opportunities.

Lester Snow and Mr. Yaeger explained the benefits and impacts of in-Delta and isolated conveyance systems. Water quality, fish-flow, water supply, and flood control are some of the benefits of an isolated facility. However, improved water quality for urban and agricultural water users in the South and Central Delta is not guaranteed unless specific criteria are established. Assurances would be needed to protect Delta water quality.

In-Delta storage proposals raise concerns regarding transport of organic carbons to urban water users. Mr. Daniel explained that the high levels of organic carbons are important to the food chain and highlighted the often conflicting concerns which will need to be addressed to provide balance to any preferred solution.

Interspersed in the discussion, staff summarized linkages between the components. Lester Snow reiterated that surface and groundwater storage would reserve peak flows during flood periods for increased flows during times critical for fish survival. He emphasized that an important issue to be addressed is the right relationship between fish flows and water supply. This issue will affect management of the watershed outside the Delta.

In terms of water quality, Mr. Woodard mentioned the benefits of reducing copper from mine drainage and use or reuse of dredge materials to reduce salts, metals and other agents associated with the sediments. Water quality would be further improved by increasing flows during dry periods.

Mr. Daniel summarized the benefits of levee improvements to habitat restoration, water supply reliability, flood control, and reuse of dredge materials. He emphasized that restoring ecosystem health would increase water supply reliability and increase opportunities for water transfers.

Mr. Yaeger summarized the benefits of urban and agricultural water use efficiency measures. Increasing efficiency would reduce demand on the Delta, improve water quality and allow more ecosystem restoration. Increased efficiency coupled with water transfers and conjunctive use would allow for greater flexibility in operating the system which would lead to increased water supply for all uses.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Raab asked if additional storage would allow for additional exports; Mr. Dunning asked if the opposite was also true. Lester Snow reported that the possibility of increasing or decreasing exports is an issue open for future discussion. He also said the questions highlight the difference between interests and positions. If stakeholder interests are addressed by meeting the Program goals and objectives, the issue of increased and decreased exports is less important to the Program.

- Ms. Selkirk wanted to ensure that as the alternatives are refined, detail is provided on the assumptions used for water demand projections. Lester Snow explained that the balancing of resource needs of the Bay-Delta are driving the solution, rather than the State's long-term water demands.

- Ms. Borgonovo followed up on Mr. Raab and Ms. Selkirk's comments. She explained that all constituencies need to know the implications of combining the components. She also remarked that many constituencies would prefer using the existing storage and conveyance systems and believe addressing the issue of how demand affects water supply reliability is critical to addressing water supply reliability. Ms. Borgonovo asked that alternative refinements make the distinction between the baseline or existing flows and any proposed increases.

- Mr. Hasseltine asked if the peaks and valleys in the water flow hydrographs could be smoothed further than indicated by staff in the example. Mr. Daniel and Mr. Buer explained that storing additional water is limited by cost and capacity of diversion systems (assumed to be 5,000 cubic feet per second) serving offstream storage reservoirs.

- Ms. Notthoff wanted more explanation on the types of techniques staff is considering for increasing Delta outflows. Lester Snow explained that options include additional storage, re-operation of existing storage, water transfers, and others. He also emphasized that the Program is focussed on making more effective use of water to improve habitat and survival of salmon and other species.

E-013976

- BDAC member Richard Izmirian asked for explanation of how entrainment of fish eggs and larvae would be reduced by the example. Mr. Daniel explained that additional storage north and south of the Delta would increase operational flexibility so exports could be curtailed during critical life stages of species that can not be protected by screening of diversions.

- Mr. Parravano and Ms. Notthoff asked for clarification regarding use of dredge materials. Lester Snow and Mr. Daniel explained that CALFED would likely seek permits for using dredge materials that are free of toxics. Mr. Daniel indicated that dredge spoils from the Bay would be used to build up levees and natural berms in the Delta and around the Bay. CALFED is not interested in using contaminated materials that increase risk to the environment.

Public Comment

- Maryann Dickinson (Metropolitan Water District) welcomed BDAC to southern California and summarized MWD's public outreach efforts. She said MWD is committed to working with BDAC and CALFED staff on developing a solution. As an example, she informed BDAC that they participated in about 500 events promoting Proposition 204. She provided the website address, www.BayDelta.org.

- Robert Bein (Southern California Water Committee) represented the Orange County business community and summarized his written comments by remarking that the alternatives are too conceptual to determine if they will provide an affordable, reliable and timely supply of water to Southern California. He informed BDAC that businesses and agriculture have moved out of California because of uncertainty about water supply. He also commented that Phase II must include a cost/benefit analysis and identify the minimum and maximum water supply potential of the alternatives.

- David McKinley (Nutra Sweet Kelco Company, San Diego) suggested that the alternatives be broken down to project-level definition to determine the water supply benefits for Southern California. His business must have a reliable water supply to compete with competitors outside of the region. He also encouraged BDAC to keep the Program moving forward in finding the solution.

- Jim Wickser (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power) reminded BDAC that the water Southern California gets from the Delta should be as high quality as possible so LADWP can meet existing and future state and federal water quality standards. During the early 1990's they received state project water which was disinfected to deal with organics, bromides and bromates. Disinfection of the water created such high levels of THM (trihalomethane) that the water quality standard could not be consistently met.

- Ed Petry (Mendota) reminded BDAC that water quality in Mendota was very poor and that regions such as Fresno are growing and will be in need of more water in the future.

BDAC took a lunch break and returned to discuss assurance issues presented by the example alternative. Lester Snow explained that one of the priorities of the Program is to assure the solution will be implemented as agreed and that there is a process to address unforeseen circumstances while implementing the solution. He further explained that assurances are not ironclad guarantees, they are not there to protect stakeholders against anything that could happen in the future. Rather, they provide a reasonable certainty that implementation will occur as agreed. Assurances are not opportunities to modify the solution.

Packages of assurances will vary with each alternative. For example, if a water storage facility is part of the solution, people will want to know that it will be permitted, funded, constructed and operated as agreed. Implementing adaptive management measures will need a process to evaluate measures, make

E-013977

modifications, secure funding to make the changes, and ensure the goals and objectives of the Program endure.

Discussion

- Mike Mantell (Secretary of CA Resources Agency) suggested that CALFED study the contractual agreements being used to implement the Natural Community Conservation Program in southern California.

4. UPDATE ON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION TARGETS (MARY SELKIRK AND DICK DANIEL)

Presentation

Mr. Daniel and Ms. Selkirk provided an update on the Introduction to Restoration Targets workshop held on November 20. Mr. Daniel quickly reviewed the objective of the workshop which was to prepare people to work with CALFED in developing the implementation objectives and targets. He referred to the November 15 preliminary working draft entitled "CALFED Bay-Delta Program Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP) Implementation Objectives and Targets" included in the BDAC meeting packet and summarized major issues raised in the draft. Mr. Daniel mentioned that five focused public meetings are scheduled in November and December 1996 to help develop the targets.

Ms. Selkirk summarized the two guest presentations and major outcomes from the workshop. Both David Fruge (U.S.F.W.S., Louisiana) and Karen Holland (U.S. E.P.A., Great Lakes) are leading programs with extensive multiple stakeholder and public participation. The Louisiana wetland restoration program relies on willing sellers and access to private lands, similar to proposals in the Ecosystem Restoration component. Ms. Selkirk reviewed a list of requirements for success provided by Ms. Holland: a) people must trust each other, b) programs should work simultaneously on several geographic levels, c) a program needs a common vision for effective restoration, d) partnerships must include commitments of time, effort, and resources, e) community leaders must be identified and willing to be flexible in finding solutions, f) the program must strike a balance between doing and researching, and g) the program must be accountable to future generations.

Comments from workshop participants for improving the Plan include: 1) clearly identify success indicators for measuring restoration progress, 2) identify which targets have multiple benefits, 3) integrate water fowl restoration plans into the CALFED program, 4) show how tidal marshes improve aquatic habitat, 5) state rationale for omitting the upper San Joaquin river and San Francisco Bay from the Plan solution area, 6) the need for flow targets, 7) describe the process for making funding decisions, and 8) future public participation programs. Ms. Selkirk identified points 3 through 8 as issues to be handled by the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group.

Mr. Daniel explained that it is CALFED's intent to incorporate programs in San Francisco Bay and elsewhere into the ERPP. He also expressed doubts for restoring historic salmon runs on the main stem of the San Joaquin River due to the presence of Friant Dam. Later in the discussion he added that the Program is developing visions for each of 36 ecological units. The sum of the individual visions will be the vision for the entire Restoration Program.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Dunning asked how the Restoration Roundtable relates to the ERPP. Lester Snow explained that the ERPP is addressing the long-term vision and actions needed for accomplishing a healthy ecosystem. The Roundtable is charged with developing a short-term implementation program consistent with the ERPP goals, objectives and targets. Ms. Selkirk added that the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group will be involved in developing the targets.

E-013978

- Later in the discussion, Mr. Graff asked if the Program has the method and approach for developing the short-term projects to be addressed by the Roundtable and if the agencies are supportive. Lester Snow informed BDAC that staff has been hired to work with the Roundtable and coordinate the project related activities. Mr. Daniel reported that the level of enthusiasm and commitment by agency staff is very high.

- Ms. Borgonovo had several comments: that the map should reflect the changes made by staff, targets should incorporate components of the integrated programs, and the rationale for each target should be explained. BDAC member Marcia Brockbank added that the Program should include a matrix of the sum of the targets. For example, the number of acres or river miles to be restored.

- Mr. Hildebrand remarked that adaptive management may change individual and cumulative impacts of the solution and that landowners who willingly sell their land cause third party impacts. Mr. Daniel explained that CALFED will provide the structure necessary to ensure the Program's mission, goals and objectives does not change. He also remarked that CALFED and NEPA/CEQA review of projects will evaluate the impacts of proposed actions. Ms. Selkirk added that impacts on agricultural lands are major policy issues for BDAC consideration.

- Mr. Pyle requested more explanation on how water flows affect restoration targets and other aspects of the CALFED program. Mr. Daniel explained that flows are only one aspect of restoration and that other measures are needed to restore the ecosystem. He remarked that the 400,000 acre feet of environmental water proposed in the Phase I alternatives may be close to the amount needed to restore the ecosystem, but that further study and consideration of CVPIA water calculations is needed before decisions can be made.

- Mr. Hasseltine questioned whether storage facilities north of the Delta would conflict with goals of increasing flows and storage south of the Delta. Mr. Daniel explained that further study should indicate when and in what locations water can be diverted to storage north of the Delta and be of most value to the system. Studies show that mid to late summer may be the most opportune time to move water south through existing facilities.

- A lengthy discussion on integration of the CVPIA and CALFED ensued. Ms. Noffhoff, Mr. Dunning, Ms. Borgonovo and Mr. Parravano requested assurances that the CVPIA fish population doubling goals would be integrated into the CALFED ecosystem restoration program. Mr. Daniel acknowledged the goal but informed BDAC that CALFED's approach is to pursue an aggressive restoration program that is scientifically based. In the case of some rivers populations may more than double, in others, due to physical constraints, doubling may not be possible. He cited problems such as physical constraints on the San Joaquin. For example, the existence of Friant Dam, the 35 cubic feet per second minimum flow requirement due to existing water rights on the river, and natural groundwater recharge at Gravelie Ford. Mr. Hildebrand responded that raising Friant Dam may address some of the problems. Lester Snow clarified CALFED's policies as being consistent with the CVPIA, because it is the law, but stated CALFED is taking an ecosystem approach and not just focusing on anadromous fish. He said CALFED is integrating the Congressional action into its Program. Mr. Patterson added that the Department of Interior and CALFED are exchanging information and that he believes there is compatibility between the CVPIA goals and the CALFED approach.

- Mr. Strelow asked if the Ecosystem Restoration Program is taking into account species that may be in trouble in the future, in addition to those that are endangered now. Mr. Daniel assured BDAC that they are taking those other species into account.

Public Comment

- Gary Bobker (Bay Institute) acknowledged the work being done to develop the targets but questioned whether enough effort has been put into developing the objectives and identifying measurements of success. He emphasized that instream flows are integral to the Program and that they need to be addressed on a policy level.

5. STORAGE AND CONVEYANCE COMPONENT

This item was incorporated into the discussion under agenda item 3.

6. IMPLICATIONS OF PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION 204 ON THE CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM (LESTER SNOW)

Presentation

Lester Snow reviewed the information on Proposition 204 which appeared in the BDAC meeting packet.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Dunning pointed out that even though federal matching funds to Proposition 204 have been authorized, they have not been appropriated to specific programs. Mr. Snow and Chair Madigan acknowledged that was the case, but the efforts of stakeholders and agencies to help ensure passage of the Proposition and matching funds are a significant step forward in getting the appropriations.

- Chair Madigan then introduced Deputy Secretary of Interior, John Garamendi. Secretary Garamendi acknowledged the hard work by stakeholders and informed BDAC that the coalitions that were formed for Proposition 204 and the related federal legislation will need to continue their persistence and achievement of consensus for getting the federal appropriations. He said the Clinton Administration still has balancing the Federal budget as a priority and as such, budgets for agency programs will be tight. Congress will want to have specific projects and programs identified before it supports assigning the federal matching funds. He outlined three basic requirements for getting support: 1) the federal budget is balanced, 2) projects are identified and prioritized and 3) support from California representatives are well coordinated and nearly unanimous. He also suggested that CALFED look to the Farm Bill, Clean Water Act, Water Resources Development Act, and other creative funding scenarios.

- Chair Madigan suggested that Interior's budget process be coordinated with CALFED's process of identifying and prioritizing projects. Secretary Garamendi supported the suggestion and remarked that this type of coordination is already occurring.

- Ms. Selkirk asked for clarification on how CALFED should identify the projects for funding. Lester Snow reminded BDAC of the actions and projects that have been identified by many programs as appropriate for funding, such as tidal wetlands development and screening of diversions. He stated that the federal funds would be available in fiscal year 1998, and the funding cycle coincides with the Ecosystem Roundtable project selection schedule. CALFED's intent is to identify projects soon so they can be included in the federal budget for FY 1998 funding.

- Mr. Pyle asked for the number of projects and level of funding to be requested for federal funding. Lester Snow referred back to cost estimates for the Phase I alternatives and explained that CALFED staff are trying to refine the estimates and break them into fiscal year funding proposals.

- Mr. Graff asked if outreach to the Department of Agriculture would be prudent and what the Secretary's views were of involving the Corps of Engineers more in the CALFED process. Secretary Garamendi was supportive of increased outreach to the Department and expressed the need to cultivate a closer working relationship with the Corps.

- Mr. Raab requested names of Congressional members to contact. Secretary Garamendi suggested that outreach continue with both Democrats and Republicans. He also emphasized that relationships with Congress would be strengthened by being as specific about projects as possible.

- Mr. Hildebrand asked for the rationale of funding projects before the solution was agreed upon. Secretary Garamendi and Lester Snow suggested that early implementation project priorities be set based on whether a project has received its permits and gone through environmental review. They also said the focus should be on projects that would not cause cumulative impacts on third parties. Chair Madigan, Lester Snow and Mr. Patterson emphasized that waiting for agreement on the solution will eliminate at least one year of funding for Category III, a delay that is unnecessary.

- Ms. Brockbank asked if CALFED will make decisions through consensus or if the agencies will vote. Secretary Garamendi assured BDAC that the agency decision making process will be reasonable given the nature of decisions to be made.

- Ms. Borgonovo asked if the importance of the CALFED process to California as a whole should override Congressional district concerns. Secretary Garamendi advised that the overall good of the Program should take precedence over turf issues.

- Ms. Notthoff requested clarification of timing of the federal budget process. Secretary Garamendi said the President's budget will be completed by the end of December. He anticipated that as more specific information is developed on CALFED projects, the additional data will be incorporated into the budget during the hearing process. He emphasized that the President is very much in support of the CALFED Program.

- Mr. Graff, Secretary Garamendi, and Mr. Mantell emphasized that State support through Proposition 204 will provide significant weight during the federal budget process. Secretary Garamendi then thanked BDAC and the CALFED Program for their support and hard work.

7. PUBLIC OUTREACH UPDATE (MARY KELLY)

Presentation

After a brief break, Mary Kelly (CALFED Program Staff) reviewed the Public Outreach document in the BDAC meeting packet. She reviewed responses to a questionnaire which was circulated to BDAC. Members asked for greater outreach to certain stakeholder groups, meetings at times convenient to people who work, and explanation of how public input is used.

Discussion

- Ms. Brockbank asked if the Program has a multi-cultural outreach strategy. Ms. Kelly stated that it is part of the Public Outreach Program, but more can be done. She also provided the Internet address for the CALFED Program.

- Lester Snow announced that Mary will be leaving the Program for employment elsewhere. He thanked her for her patience, cooperation and hard work.

8. SUMMARY OF BDAC DELIBERATIONS ON WATER USE EFFICIENCY, WATER TRANSFERS, AND PROGRAM DURABILITY (LESTER SNOW)

Lester Snow reviewed the memo in the BDAC meeting packet entitled "Outcome of BDAC Deliberations on Water Transfers, Water Use Efficiency, and Durability".

9. PREVIEW OF WORK GROUPS AND JANUARY BDAC MEETING (MIKE MADIGAN)

BDAC members and staff reviewed schedules for different BDAC Work Group and public meetings in December and January. Staff agreed to provide timely information on the Ecosystem Roundtable and Water Use Efficiency Work Group meetings and strategy updates.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

E-013982